

s which the proposed will buy, and less about on costs." The power will retain the power of for power is exceeding-itself. No matter; the, like the dog-license pay the freight. But ay of royalty, the right

## te to Groceries

possible for a bureaucracy ut. It could not do so aucrats did not like to powers, which they do. he way a civilized so-out making a living, por-ity must slither into of our economy once it gle phase.

recently came upon this d to rub its eyes to be it saw. The Rural Elec-Administration had au-loan of \$200,000 for the d rehabilitation of a cre-pany. Now the enabling es that REA loans must r the purpose of financing nstruction and operating ng plants, electric trans-distribution lines and or the furnishing of elec-y to persons in rural areas ot receiving station serv-ice nothing is said about fi-eosote companies, a con-ommittee wants to know,

A responds quite logically are required for the trans-lectric energy, and poles e creosoted. The House queries: why not, then, he purchase and operation and saw mills, copper elters, refineries and wire eed, why not? Let's look lectric energy is provided rs; laborers must have household furnishings and the logic of the situation ify REA loans to all the ndustries, manufacturing utive. Why not? One up a reasonable argument A loan to a neighborhood

men are politicians, not . Therefore, when they into existence they kept on the clause: "for the of electric energy to per-al areas . . ." That was er. One could hardly ex-to follow through on the consequences of their leg-

t, the economic conse-ere inevitable. In a civ-omy, with its manifold spe-s, it is impossible to keep phase from impinging on . The doctor is dependent

first privilege, the first subsidy, the first license or patent, the first intrusion of political power into our economic life. The

are explanatory. That is, is the backbone of individual dignity as strong as the public debt it must carry?

## WHO'S GOT THE RIGHT BUTTON?

SEVERAL readers have asked: Just where do you stand? Besides criticizing, what is your policy?

The latest attempt to pigeon-hole *analysis* comes from a friend who has gone out of his way to induce people to read it. He thinks the circulation would prosper if its ideological position were put into a few words, an ear-tickling formula which, prominently displayed, would serve as an intellectual sign-post for the prospective reader. At least, it might guarantee the customer against any impairment of his political morals or weakening of his pet prejudices; the "strictly kosher" label would give him a sense of safety.

There is something to this idea. Labels do have a value. For instance, when you see "Dodgers" or "Giants" emblazoned across the shirts of athletes you are able to follow the game more intelligently than if the identification were lacking. Then, it is important to know that the fruit juice you are buying is "unsweetened," especially if you're on a diabetic diet. If you are gifted with a lot of gall you print "All the News That's Fit to Print" or "World's Greatest Newspaper" on the masthead of your paper, and the re-iteration may pay you dividends..

The difficulty is in finding the proper slogan, the flattering identifier, the descriptive label. Particularly so with a paper that aims only to encourage independent thinking—just thinking—about how our cock-eyed world got that way, economically and politically, and isn't afraid to point up root causes. For the readers of such a journal a slogan is insultingly superfluous; they need no pill to aid their digestion. Those who are mentally incapacitated, or whose thinking is blocked by prejudices, are not fit customers for *analysis*, and any slogan tricking them into buying it would be dishonest. Nevertheless, the editor would be grateful for a succinct formula which would both ease his labor by delimiting the scope of his editorializing and facilitate the reader's appreciation of his work. Who has it?

Mr. Rodman, the friend who brings up the matter, suggests one: "This sheet is an honest effort to help democracy work. It is dedicated to the fight for the Rights of Man and the subordination of the State: True Democracy Free from Communism, Fascism or Socialism."

Well, this is about as good as any I have seen. I presume the last clause is the flag he would nail on our mast. However, I am hesitant about the word "democracy." Which is the "true" kind? Usage has given it several connotations, some of which are inconsistent with the direction of this "sheet." Socialism has appropriated "democracy" unto itself, and it is a very common word in communistic jargon. People of these persuasions would suspect "true democracy" which excluded their dogmas. Also, there are protectionists, hundred percent Jew-and-Negro hating Americans, privilege seekers of all kinds and my-country-right-or-wrong chauvinists who are all for "democracy" and would be dead set against this paper's interpretation of the Rights of Man.

No, the suggested label is not quite the correct identifier. One there is that I would like to use if I thought it would convey to possible readers what it means to me. It is a sentence used on a memorable occasion by a truly great American: "I am for man." I am afraid, however, that these words, meaningful as they are, would not constitute a circulation-getter.

The search must go on. Or, maybe *analysis*—like a woman who must be known to be appreciated—does not lend itself to labelling.

because it can get all it needs by filching the pay-envelope of the producing public. You realize, then, how the income tax is an additional high-hurdle for free trade to jump.

You learn, too, that during the twenty-four years before 1861, when federal income kept ahead or in sight of federal expenses, only eight presidents served, none for more than four years and two for less than two years; and you ponder on the economy of holding frequent elections and making one term mandatory. It takes time to build up a machine.

Mr. Foulke points out that during the regime of Andrew Jackson the annual national income was generally in excess of outgo, but lest you get the impression that thrift had anything to do with it he tells you, "those were the days when land was gladly and freely sold by the Federal Government at \$1.25 per acre."

And so you pick up from page to page, from paragraph to paragraph, a fact and a figure that starts you thinking. You learn that Alexander Hamilton, father of centralization, was dead set against spending for spending's sake, the current policy, and that the much maligned "Silent Cal" managed the money affairs of the nation as a decent president should. You get, particularly, a keen analysis of the Rooseveltian doctrine of the national debt, trickily entitled "We owe it to ourselves." It would do injustice to Mr. Foulke's uncovering of this legerdmain to try to boil it down. Read it. You can get a copy by writing to Roy A. Foulke, vice-president, Dun & Bradstreet, Inc., 299 Broadway, New York.

## More for G.I. Joe

Last month, in commenting on the "G.I. Bill of Rights," I pointed out that the proposed guarantee of loans to ex-soldiers who desire to go in for farming amounted to nothing more than a boost in land values, and that therefore land speculators would be the real beneficiaries of this law. G.I. Joe would get only the privilege of carrying an extra mortgage-debt.

Upon further examination of the law it appears that the whole scheme is a cruel mirage. It is stipulated that the loan must not carry an interest rate of more than 4%. Now, banks are not making small loans at less than 5%, and even the FHA will insure non-veteran loans at 4½%. After the war, with capital much in demand for resurgent civilian production, a four percent rate on small loans will be out of the question. Therefore, except for some token loans, "for the sake of appearances," the ex-hero will find the government's offer to guarantee his loan a rather mean gesture.

Again one is impelled to repeat the rhetorical question: why do people have faith in politicians?